

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/534,971 | 10/25/2005 | Shelley-Anne Salisbury | M0025.0329/P329 | 1717 |
| 24998 DICKSTEIN S | 7590 11/21/200 [.] SHAPIRO LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| 1825 EYE STR | REET NW | | DOAN, ROBYN KIEU | |
| Washington, DC 20006-5403 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | • | 3732 | |
| | | | | |
| • | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | • | 11/21/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | H | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/534,971 | SALISBURY ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Robyn Doan | 3732 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | , | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 M This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E | action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 70-76 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 70-76 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | on No ed in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | . 4) ☐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | nte | |
| Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other: | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/534,971

Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's Amendment filed 5/29/2007 has been entered and carefully considered. Claims 70-75 have been amended. New claim 76 has been added. The terminal disclaimer filed 5/29/2007 has overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection. Limitations of amended claims 72-74 and new claim 76 have not been found to be patentable over prior art of record, therefore, claims 70-76 are rejected under the same and new ground rejections as set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 70, 71 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newlin.

With regard to claims 70, 71, 75, Newlin disclosed a hair clip (figs. 1 and 4) comprising a body (28), cylindrical jaws (14, 16, fig. 4) having teeth (18) extending therefrom in a cylindrical circumferential direction, wings portions (40) extending tangentially from the jaws, the jaws being pivotally connected to the body (at 30) defining laterally spaces axes about jaws pivot, the jaws define a substantially cylindrical volume (see fig. 4) for receiving hair, a spring (32) arrangement for biasing

Application/Control Number: 10/534,971

Art Unit: 3732

the jaws in closed position. Newlin fails to show part of the body being a substantially cylindrical shape, however, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the body and the jaws being a substantially cylindrical shape, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the shape of the known component. A change in shape is generally recognized as being within the level or ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Claims 72, 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newlin in view of Sartena (USP 6,135,125).

With regard to claims 72, 73, Newlin discloses the essential claimed invention as claimed in claims 70, 71, 75 as discussed above except for the teeth mesh or meet interdigitatedly in closed position. Sartena discloses a hair clip (figs. 1, 2) comprising a pair of jaws (11, 12) having teeth (16) mesh or meet interdigitatedly (see figs. 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to construct the particular teeth configuration as taught by Sartena as an alternative way to grip the hair.

Claims 74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Newlin in view of Lloyd (USP 6,142,159).

With regard to claims 74, 76, Newlin discloses the essential claimed invention as claimed in claims 70, 71, 75 as discussed above except for the teeth mesh substantially

Application/Control Number: 10/534,971

Art Unit: 3732

in parallel in closed position. Lloyd discloses a hair clip (fig. 3) comprising a pair of jaws (11, 12) having teeth (13,14) mesh in parallel (see fig. 3). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to construct the particular teeth configuration as taught by Lloyd as an alternative way to grip the hair.

Response to Arguments

Applicant has argued it would have not been obvious to alter the shape of the body of Newlin and it would teach away from the provision of the integral hairbrush hidden within the hairclip. This is not true, because one skill in the art would only change the upper part (26) of the body into the cylindrical shape and such modification would not ruin the hairbrush compartment neither the hairclip.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3732

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cris Rodriguez can be reached on (571) 272-4964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Robyn Doan/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

rkd November 14, 2007